DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 761 SO 018 261

AUTHOR	Chamberlain, Mariam; And Others
TITLE	Women in Development: Theory and Practice. Report of the Conference (New York, New York, March 23, 1983).
INSTITUTION	National Council for Research on Women, New York, NY.
SPONS AGENCY	City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Hunter Coll.
PUB DATE	83
NOTE	67p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Developing Nations; *Females; *Feminism; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; Resource Materials; Sex Discrimination; Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; Social Studies; United States History; Womens Education; *Womens Studies

ABSTRACT

The participants at this conference were scholars brought together to discuss women's issues in the context of research and practice. By reviewing a decade or more of research, they examined diverse meanings and implications of feminism and the elimination of stereotypes. Conference papers were presented by Florence Howe, editor of "Women's Studies Quarterly"; Hanna Papanek, Senior Research Associate at the Center for Asian Development Studies, Boston University; and Nadia Youssef, Senior Policy Specialist on Women's Participation in Economic Activities and Basic Services, UNICEF. These papers set the conference format by delineating issues and setting the stage for subsequent workshops. The participants agreed that information about women could not be adequately derived from the context of local history, environment, and societal arrangements. There was much less agreement on the definition of feminism and whether it meant the restructuring of society toward greater justice for both men and women or the development of women within existing conditions. The participants agreed that the most productive part of the conference was the destruction of stereotypes through the sharing of information about the immense diversity of conditions among women in developing countries. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SD

ED283761

WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT

THEORY AND PRACTICE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M.E.S. Capek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CONFERENCE OF MARCH 23, 1983

CO-SPONSORED BY

HUNTER COLLEGE

AND

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR RESEARCH ON WOMEN

SO018261

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The National Council for Research on Women

Report on

Women in Development: Theory and Practice

A One-Day Conference - March 23, 1983

Co-sponsored by Hunter College and

The National Council on Research for Women

We are sending you, as promised, the report on the conference. If you are interested in participating in future meetings on particular aspects of women in development, please let us know.

Mariam Chamberlain Susan Lees Marion F. Levy

Conference Coordinators

The Sara Delano Roosevelt Memorial House / 47-49 East 65th Street / New York, N.Y. 10021

Report on

"Women in Development: Theory and Practice"

A One-Day Conference - March 23, 1983

Co-sponsored by Hunter College and
The National Council on Research for Women

Contents:

1. Conference Report

2. Appendix 1 - Participants List
Appendix 2 - Address by Florence Howe
Appendix 3 - Address by Hanna Papanek
Appendix 4 - Address by Nadia Youssef
Appendix 5 - Workshop Guidelines
Appendix 6 - Introductory Remarks by Susan Lees
Appendix 7 - Introductory Remarks by Mariam Chamberlain
Appendix 8 - Workshop Reports (8A - 8F)

REPORT ON A ONE-DAY CONFERENCE,

"WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT: THEORY AND PRACTICE"

CO-SPONSORED BY

HUNTER COLLEGE AND THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON RESEARCH FOR WOMEN

ROOSEVELT HOUSE, NEW YORK MARCH 23, 1983

BACKGROUND

The genesis of the conference "Women in Development: Theory and Practice" was a series of conversations between members of the Anthropology and Women's Studies Departments at Hunter College, and the President of the National Council on Research for Women in the spring of 1982. The planning group of three, Susan Lees, Professor of Anthropology and Marion Fennelly Levy, Adjunct Assistant Professor in Anthropology and Women's Studies, Hunter College, and Mariam Chamberlain, President of the National Council and a member of the Economics faculty at Hunter, met with academics active in research in developing countries and representatives of international development agencies, to explore their interest in such a conference. We chose institutions and individuals from the Greater New York area as a geographical base.

Assured that there was important support for a conference and that there was nothing similar done in the region, the planning group met with Dr. Joyce Moock of the Rockefeller Foundation to seek funding assistance. A proposal was prepared and submitted to the Foundation and was subsequently approved in December, 1982.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Because the conference was seen as an initial step in what we hoped would be a continuing interchange between scholars and practitioners in the New York region, the participant list was deliberately limited and carefully selected. As described in the proposal, the participants were to represent women in development specialists from the major colleges and universities in the area, and representatives of the United Nations agencies and major private voluntary organizations such as CARE, Catholic Relief Service, Save the Children, Church World Service, etc.

Although our selection of participants was primarily restricted to the New York area, fortunately that group included a significant number of women from Third World countries.

The participants were chosen in consultation with many academic and agency colleagues, with great care given to balancing the number of each. Eighty-five participants were invited of whom seventy-six attended (Appendix 1). At least twelve to fifteen additional people asked to attend but had to be refused because of the strictly limited capacity of Roosevelt House. On the other hand, we had more drop-outs than expected (and late substitutions) due to uncertain travel schedules, last minute child care demands, and other exigencies.

CONFERENCE FORMAT

The planning group decided that the issues to be addressed at the conference should be presented by outstanding members of the Women in Development community, representing its various perspectives; therefore, we commissioned conference papers from:

Florence Howe, Professor of American Studies at the State University of New York College at Old Westbury; President of the Feminist Press and editor of Women's Studies Quarterly and its international supplements.

Hanna Papanek, Senior Research Associate at the Center for Asian Development Studies, Boston University, and a widely published writer.

Nadia Youssef, Senior Policy Specialist on Women's Participation in Economic Activities and Basic Services, UNICEF. She is former director of research at the International Center for Research on Women.

Their papers (Appendices 2, 3, and 4) not only delineated the important issues of the conference, but set the stage for the afternoon workshops.

The planning group met frequently in the fall and identified workshop topics and leaders. It was decided that workshops would be most appropriate if led jointly by a scholar and a practitioner. Together, they would develop questions related to the subject of the particular workshop that might be expected to provoke the liveliest and most fruitful discussion.

General workshop topics were to be: Women in the Workforce; Food and Agriculture Technologies; Health; Education; Women's Participation in Development Planning; Fertility Control and Reproductive Issues; The Family. The Family workshop was cancelled for lack of sufficient registration.

A meeting was called on February 23, 1983 for all workshop leaders and the planning group to explore various formats for the workshops and to discuss general guidelines, which had been prepared and distributed (or mailed) to leaders (Appendix 5).

CONFERENCE

The conference took place, as planned, on March 23, 1983 at Roosevelt House, with a fluctuating attendance of fifty-five to seventy-six participants. After introductions (Appendices 6 and 7), the agenda was as follows:

MORNING - Plenary Session

9:00 Coffee and Registration
9:30 Welcome, President of Hunter College, Dr. Donna Shalala
Introductions, Marion Fennelly Levy

Opening Remarks
Susan Lees, Hunter College
Mariam Chamberlain, National Council for Research on Women

10:00 Speakers:
Florence Howe, Feminist Press
Hanna Papanek, Center for Asian Development Studies

Discussant:
Nadia Youssef, Senior Policy Specialist, UNICEF

LUNCHEON
12:15 - 1:30

AFTERNOON	Workshops	Workshop Leaders	
1:45-3:45	Women in the Workforce	Hanna Papanek, Center for Asian Development Studies	Ulla Olin, UNDP
	Food and Agriculture Technologies	Joan Mencher, Herbert Lehman College-CUNY	Irene Tinker, EPOC
	Health	Jan Dobbs, Columbia University	Helen Bratcher, Catholic Relief Services
	Education	Audrey Smock, World Issues Sec'y. United Church of Christ	Pratima Kale, SAVE the Children
	Women's Participation in Development Planning	Lourdes Beneria, Rutgers University	Sandra Sennett, CARE
	Fertility Control and Reproductive Issues	Gilbert Shimmel, Hunter College	Lybia Burgos, Margaret Sanger Clinic

After the presentations of the prepared papers, there was a discussion period. A buffet luncheon, with no accompanying program, allowed participants time for informal exchanges.

Directly after the workshop sessions, there was a plenary at which the workshop rapporteurs reported briefly on the major concerns or observations expressed in their respective groups (Appendix 9).

The final points, briefly addressed at the plenary, included the proposed 1985 conference observing the end of the United Nations Decade for Women to be held in Nairobi, and the interest among the conference attendees in participating in the planning. The concluding question dealt with an objective of the conference. Was there a nucleus of participants who would wish to continue the exchanges started at this conference through either a loosely structured coalition, or by occasional, informal meetings around particular topics? Although there were expressions of interest, the consensus was that individual participants would communicate with the conference planning group with ideas of how and if they wished to meet again.

We have received several letters commending the conference and expressing further interest in meeting and we intend to follow-up with other participants.

CONFERENCE EVALUATION AND REVIEW

The primary motive for holding this conference was to bring together individuals, mainly working in the New York region, who are engaged in different aspects of Women and Development, to talk to one another. This was accomplished in two ways: the raising of provocative issues by the morning speakers provided bases for agreement and disagreement among Conference participants; and the afternoon workshops provided an opportunity for all participants to express their views on subjects related to their specific interests, experiences and expertise.

Three related issues emerged as the common denominators of discussion during the conference: contextualization in research and practice; the diverse meanings and implications of feminism; and the destruction of stereotypes which had been the product of research and theory of a decade or more ago.

If there was agreement on anything at this conference, it was emphatically on the importance of contextualization of data on women and development. No information about women could be comprehended adequately, that is, out of the context of local history, environment, societal arrangements, political constraints, culture, or the expressed needs of women themselves. This need to place information in context underscores

the importance of collaborative work among scholars and practitioners to be sure. It also underscores the risk of applying generalizations, even general theory, in providing guidelines for practice in particular projects and policies undertaken by development agencies with regard to women. If general theory is to be useful, it must somehow take context into account.

This brings us to our second issue, feminism, about which there was little agreement. Some participants felt that the goal of practical work on women and development should be, explicitly, a restructuring of society toward greater justice and equality for women and men in all societies. Others felt that a preconception of how society ought to be structured was inappropriate, and that development practice was obliged to accommodate to diverse existing local conditions, whatever they might be. Still others felt that while there was perhaps a middle ground, insistence upon explicitness in regard to feminist goals was often damaging to these goals because of negative resistance by both sponsors and recipients of development assistance. Some also felt that the term "feminism" was strongly associated with an American or Western brand of feminism, which itself evoked strong negative responses in the Third World, though other forms of feminism might be locally acceptable. Disagreements on these points of view did not follow any discernible breakdown according to the country of origin of the participants, or identity as "academic" or "practitioner." It is not at all clear that we are approaching an agreement through discussion of our differences, but it was generally felt that it was good to air our diverse points of view among ourselves.

Finally, and perhaps most productive, particularly in the workshops, was the destruction of stereotypes through sharing of information about the immense diversity of conditions among women in the developing countries. Although research and theory emerging in the early 1970s was stimulating and productive, many of the ideas of this period appear not to apply in the myriad of new cases that have been studied since that time. Assumptions about women's time allocations, place in the family or the labor market, family planning decisions, and so forth, must be rethought case by case. This is an encouraging sign that the "state of the art" has progressed during the last decade; we now know much, much more than we did about women and development. However, it seems to be premature to draw up new theoretical formulations at this point; we seem now to be in a period of information-collection, and re-evaluation of existing theory.

One final point should be mentioned. Many of the participants, particularly those situated in development or assistance agencies, expressed a sense of isolation in their day-to-day work. Meeting face-to-face with dozens of others who shared their concerns and interests provided them with great reinforcement. It was felt that here was a potential for a necessary support group for those who are, all too often, a minority voice. We hope that the potential will be realized, now that the initial step has been taken.

APPENDIX 1

PARTICIPANTS

WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE

Barbara Adams
Quaker Center for the U. N.
777 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Neuma Aguiar
Women's Studies Research Center
University of Wisconsin
209 N. Brooks Street
Madison, WI 53706

Marie Paul Aristy
INSTRAW, BR 1914
United Nations
New York, NY 10017

Patricia Baldi
Center for Population
and Family Health
60 Haven Avenue
New York, NY 10032

Elinor Barber
Institute of International
Education
809 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Barbara Baruch
Meals for Millions
815 Second Avenue
New York, NY 10017

Daniel Bates
Hunter College
Anthropology Department
695 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10021

Lourdes Beneria
Department of Economics
Livingston College
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ 08903

Alison Bernstein
Ford Foundation
320 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017

Maggie Black
UNICEF
866 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Helen Bratcher
Catholic Relief Services
1011 First Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Lybia Burgos
Margaret Sanger Center
380 Second Avenue
New York, NY 10010

Pamela Cain
Sociology Department
Hunter College
695 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10021

Francis Conant
Anthropology Department
Hunter College
695 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10021

Mariam Chamberlain
National Council for Research on Women
47-49 East 65th Street
New York, NY 10021

Jan Dobbs
Teachers College,
Columbia University
525 W. 120th Street
New York, NY 10027

Betty Dooley
Women's Research and
Education Institute
204 Fourth St. S.E.
Washington, DC 20003

Alexandra Duval
Save the Children
54 Wilton Road
Westport, CT 06880

Daisy Hilse Dwyer
Anthropology Department
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027

Janet Edmundsen
Columbia University
225 W. 106th Street
New York, NY 10025

Nagat El-Sanabary
Center for the Study,
Education and Advancement
of Women
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Eleanor Fapohunda
Center for the Study of
Women and Society
CUNY Graduate Center
33 West 42nd Street
New York, NY 10036

Mahmazet Hapte-Mariam
UNICEF
866 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Dorothy Helly
Hunter College
695 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10021

Florence Howe
The Feminist Press
Box 334
Old Westbury, NY 11568

Dr. Pratima Kale
Save the Children
54 Wilton Road
Westport, CT 06880

Nuhad Kanawati
UNICEF
866 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Hanna Kebede
310 East 44th St., Apt. 512
New York, NY 10017

Eleanor Leacock
Anthropology Department
CUNY
33 West 42nd Street
New York, NY 10036

Susan Lees
Anthropology Department
Hunter College
695 Park Avenue
New York, NY 1021

Louise Lennihan
Hunter College
Anthropology Department
695 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10021

Johanna Lessinger
1128A International Affairs
Southern Asia Institute
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027

Marion F. Levy
Women's Studies Department
Hunter College
695 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10021

Marjorie Lightman
Institute for Research
in History
432 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10016

Susan Lowes
Teachers College,
Columbia University
525 West 120th Street
New York, NY 10027

Maxine McCants
The Feminist Press
Box 334
Old Westbury, NY 11568

Sheila Avrin McLean
848 Carroll Street
Brooklyn, NY 11215

Katherine McGee
Ford Foundation
320 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017

Joan Mencher
Herbert Lehman College
CUNY
Bedford Park & Boulevard
New York, NY 10467

Joyce Moock
Rockefeller Foundation
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

Janice Monk
Southwest Institute for
Research on Women
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721

Wendy Ng
c/o Joan Acker
Department of Sociology
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

Nancy Nicalo
Church World Service
475 Riverside Drive
New York, NY 10027

Ulla Olin
UNDP/PCCA
1 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Aihwa Ong
Hampshire College
Amherst, MA 01002

Hanna Papanek
Asian Center 264 BSR
Boston University
Boston, MA 02215

Caroline Pezzullo
Caroline Pezzullo Associates
1 Sherman Square
New York, NY 10023

Sarah Pomeroy
Hunter College
Women's Studies Department
695 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10021

Aruna Rao
UNICEF
866 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Amal Rassam
1270 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10029

Barbara Reno
Chase Manhattan Bank
1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, 24th Fl.
New York, NY 10081

Mary Rubin
National Council for Research on Women
47-49 East 65th Street
New York, NY 10021

Sandra Sennett
CARE
660 First Avenue
New York, NY 10016

Kate Shackford
African American Institute
833 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Jill Sheffield
Carnegie Corporation
437 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Gilbert Shimmel
Hunter College
695 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10021

Dagmar Schultz
Free University of Berlin, Kennedy Inst.
Gustav Muller Platz 4
1000 Berlin 62, West Germany

Audrey Smock, World Issues Sec'y.
United Church of Christ
475 Riverside Drive
New York, NY 10115

Myra Strober
Center for Research on Women
Serra House
Serra Street
Stanford, CA 94305

Carolyn Stremlau
PACT
777 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Barbara Ellen Swartz
75 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201

Betty Jo Swayze
National Board, YWCA
135 West 50th Street
New York, NY 10019

Amy Swerdlow
Sarah Lawrence College
1 Meadoway
Bronxville, NY 10708

Cristina Blanc Szanton
Southern Asia Institute
420 West 118th Street
New York, NY 10027

Belgin Tekce
Population Council
1 Dag Hammarskjold Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Irene Tinker
Equity Policy Center
1525 18th Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

George Worthington
Society for International
Development
380 Second Avenue
New York, NY 10010

Carol Vance
Anthropology Department
Columbia University
525 West 120th Street
New York, NY 10027

Joan Vanek
Statistical Office
Room 3010, United Nations
New York, NY 10017

Phyllis Vine
Sarah Lawrence College
1 Meadoway
Bronxville, NY 10708

Wendy Wakeman
Save the Children
54 Wilton Road
Westport, CT 06880

Anne Walker
International Women's Tribune
Center
305 East 46th Street
New York, NY 10017

Eimi Watanabe
UNICEF
866 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Nadia Youssef
UNICEF
866 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Sondra Zeidenstein
Gassho Associates
R.S. East Street North
Goshen, CT 06756

Ana Zentella
Hunter College
Black and Puerto Rican Studies
695 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10021

APPENDIX 2

NOTES ON WOMEN'S STUDIES AS AN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLE, PERSPECTIVE AND PRACTICE

by

Florence Howe

Professor of American Studies, State University of New York College at Old Westbury; President of The Feminist Press and editor of Women's Studies Quarterly

First I'd like to share with you the feeling I have about this building, just for a moment. It was my "campus" when I was a student more than 35 years ago. I always have a good feeling as I pass through its doors. I experienced Hunter, and its extension, Roosevelt House, as an institution that cared for women students who were poor and unknowledgeable about the world--when no one else cared. And the treatment accorded such students--and I am speaking very personally here--was the sort we would want for women the world over: with dignity and love. It is strange perhaps to report that I felt loved at Hunter by what might have seemed, or what might still seem to an historian studying the institution in the forties, a very large anonymous place, a vertical skyscraper. And it was that, on one level. But there was this house, and there were people in the skyscraper and in this house who did care for students as persons, whatever their origins. It is in that spirit that I want to approach my remarks.

For though I felt the dignity and the love the institution had to offer me as a student, I did not receive the knowledge due me as a female student. Indeed, in most respects, I didn't know there was anything special about being a female student, apart from the fact that I knew I couldn't do certain things because I wasn't a man. I cannot blame the institution, for such failures were those of all educational institutions until the last decade, and of many institutions still. Most of us in the room were educated with only what M. Carey Thomas, early president of Bryn Mawr, called "the men's curriculum" in our minds and hearts. She coined that phrase to describe not only what the curriculum was about--that was not her concern--but rather that it was considered too difficult for female brains and too harmful to their uterine development. It was the men's because it took a long battle to acquire it for the women. And all through that battle no one remarked on the possibility that it might not be as serviceable to women as it had been to men.

In our own time, we have been witness to the explosion of knowledge about women and gender that we call "women's studies," and in our own time, we understand that education may be used, indeed was used knowingly or unknowingly, to keep women in their

subordinate place. This explosion of knowledge about women and gender has, of course, not been confined to the U.S., and it has not been confined to views of women in the U.S. Although for many reasons women's studies in the U.S. has been focused on the status of U.S. women, and on the restoration of their lost history and culture, this work has been significantly inclusive of the relationships among gender, race, class and national origin, and, in general of the the U.S. as a complex, multicultural, multi-racial nation. And women's studies has focused more on the masses of women than on the elites. Its U.S.-centeredness is due, I believe, not only to the complexity of our own historical and cultural fabric, but also to the root impetus for the development of the area at all. Women's studies grew out of the women's movement, and out of a sense of the need for the educational arm of that movement to contribute to envisioning how to improve the lives of women. In the beginning we thought that discrimination was responsible, for example, for the small number of educated women in this country who actually chose to go on to the doctorate. But studies of the male-centered curriculum, and then other studies of the history of the development of higher education for women in the U.S. convinced many of us that the curriculum was the villain in the piece: that to be educated in hope and reality was to be the goal of feminist education, and that what women in the U.S. needed was a feminist education, if education was to help them change their lives, and to learn to work in groups to become capable of changing more than the lives of occasional and lucky individuals.

By the middle of the seventies, and especially following the Mexico City meetings in 1975, women's studies, interpreted in many different ways, was beginning in many different countries. And of course, here in the U.S. and in the West more generally something called "women and development" was also beginning. By the mid-seventies, even so U.S. rooted a practitioner of women's studies as I was reading Ester Boserup's seminal work (which appeared, of course, in 1970, that special year that also producted Sexual Politics [Millet], The Black Woman [Toni Cade], and Sisterhood is Powerful [Robin Morgan]). I was thinking, in the mid-seventies, yes, the study of women's lives is essential to all human life, and especially now when nations, not simply individuals or groups, are making policy to affect the lives of millions.

Today I want to begin with some remarks about women's studies as international principle, perspective and practice. And despite the danger of adding still another set of introductory remarks, let me say a word about my intention here. One purpose of this conference is to initiate a dialogue between two groups of people who have been in motion on behalf of women for the past decade, but who have not, in general, worked together: the people who are called "practitioners" who are specialists on the lives of women in so-called developing countries; and the people

who are called "academics" whom I call (confusingly) "women's studies practitioners". I believe that these two groups of women share a great deal, in perspective and in practice, and perhaps also in principle. One of the most important ideas we share is that education is not only a question of entrance into formal educational institutions called schools or colleges. And though I will often be talking about formal education, like those of you who are development "practitioners," I also these days do not often work in educational institutions. Like you, I rarely teach a class in a formal institutional setting, but I take advantage of every educational opportunity to teach, formally or informally, about women's educational needs. And women's studies as a principle and a perspective is practiced not only in schools and colleges, but in prisons, in community centers, in health projects, in agricultural projects--in short, in every phase of life. Its ultimate purpose is to improve the status of women, and of course this is a purpose we all share.

Women's studies as an international educational principle. The principle of women's equal access to education, fought for and only recently won in United Nations doctrine, defines that education as already institutionalized for men. That is, women are to have equal access to men's education in each country of the world. It may seem arrogant to say now, knowing the painfully slow progress of opening doors to women, that access is not enough. But I must say that anyway, since access for women means sitting through a curriculum in which men achieve, create, and think, and women are absent, totally invisible, or caricatured as ignorant innocents and/or sexual devils. Access for women is not enough if, on leaving the educational institution, men move on to work and women to domesticity, unaware even of options besides the sex-segregated ones.

Perhaps it is not wise to state a principle in negative terms, but I will begin that way: access is not enough--women need access to an education that offers a human, humane, and accurate portrait of women in history and in the present, as well as to an education that offers them a vision of a world in which they have a right both to family life and the dignity of decent paid employment. Obviously, I am not a writer of principles for the United Nations, but you certainly get my point. The principle in educational terms suggests that women need not what men already have, if what they have is derogatory to women and supportive only to men; rather they need something else. Obviously, in a world in which the two sexes still have to live together, men need this new curriculum as well--as I shall illuminate later on when I get to the question of practice.

Women's studies as an international educational perspective. If I use the label "feminist" to define the perspective, I can, in part, be accused of repeating rather than defining, for it is hard for me to imagine women's studies without a feminist perspective, and for me, especially as a person who works mainly in education, the two terms are synonymous. But there are feminists for whom women's studies doesn't exist; and there are women's studies practitioners, in India, for example, who would confine the term "feminist" only to a very special group of women--to those who consider class and caste or race as significant as gender in all considerations relevant to improving the status of women.

While I am that kind of feminist, I had to explain to Indian women that we would also allow the label to feminists who did not think especially about those other dimensions of life. We would simply, in the American way, call them "conservative" feminists rather than "liberal" or "radical" feminists.

A feminist perspective sees patriarchy as root cause of the subordinate status of women: that is, the historical and universal domination of men over women in all phases of life, religion, politics, economics, culture, and so forth. A feminist perspective today sees women not only as oppressed by this domination, prevented in many instances from achieving full human potential, and in many more instances from living even a somewhat decent life; but also as strong survivors and, through all the centuries of deprivation, as making a significant contribution to humanity, as being what Mary Beard called "a force in history." At the center of deprivation, from one feminist perspective, is the denial to women of education, of learning, and hence, of the ability to create new knowledge, even to name the world women inhabit as a separate women's culture, a world of value. The contributions we now study of women's achievement through this long history of oppression and deprivation focus in part on the creating of a separate "subculture" that includes many traditions passed down from generation to generation, from mothers and aunts to daughters and sisters, and from women to other women in lifelong friendships.

Women's studies as an international educational practice. I have of course, been too brief about perspective, but perhaps there will be time in discussion for me to make explicit some of the other matters I have taken for granted, since I am hastening on to an area I prefer--practice. What has been happening these thirteen or fourteen years? In scholarship and in the curriculum, we have been developing and rediscovering a body of knowledge about women and gender that has begun to make itself felt on what we now call the "mainstream," though it is really only the story of the other half of the human life.

What I have done both to save time and as a strategy for giving you something is to zerox on a separate sheet of paper what I used to call my "laundry list" of items in the U.S. women's studies curriculum. As you will see, "women and development" is but one item on this list, though it might also, in practice, include many of the other items. This list describes both the curriculum that has developed and the areas of research on women and gender now included when we talk about the "new scholarship on women," or when we talk about "women's studies." As I say at the top of the sheet, in each case, women's studies practitioners are attempting to be specific about the intersections of race and class with gender, and, in some small number of cases, such scholars as Hanna Papanek, for example, are also able to use information about women from countries outside the U.S. for comparative purposes. Let me add also that, where feminists in countries abroad have begun to write their own laundry lists--as in India, for example--the topics are not unlike these, though they may not yet be as thematic or interdisciplinary.

To be quoted from and reproduced, provided credit is appropriately acknowledged to Florence Howe, The Feminist Press, Old Westbury, New York 11568.

WOMEN'S STUDIES IN THE CURRICULUM AND IN SCHOLARSHIP

Note: Since women represent all social classes, all races, all religions, all national groups, in each case one must pay close attention to race and class as one considers gender.

1. An understanding of the philosophical, sociological and political underpinnings of patriarchy: religion, the power of class and caste, of race and national origin, as they relate to gender; a full understanding of what it means to be born into the "permanent" status of a "dominant" male or a "subordinate" female.

2. An understanding of socialization and sex-role stereotyping, of the processes through which females become feminized and males masculinized.

3. An understanding of women in history and women as history, including legal as well as medical history; the history of birth control, for example, is essential to the study of women, even to the study of fiction about women.

4. An understanding of women as represented in the arts they have produced, some of which have been buried or ignored as arts--quilt-making, for example, or the pottery of North American Indian women; as well as an awareness that the "images" of women portrayed by the arts produced by men have helped control our conceptions of women; an understanding of images of women on TV, in the film and theatre, and in advertising.

5. An understanding of the ways in which psychology, especially post-Freudian psychology, has attempted to control women's destiny; an awareness of other male-centered psychological constructs as potentially damaging to women; an understanding of new female-centered ideas about the psychology of women.

6. An understanding of female sexuality, including reproduction, heterosexuality and homosexuality.

7. An understanding of the complex, confusing and largely chaotic area of biological and psychological sex differences; the importance here of null findings.

8. An understanding of the concept of health as it applies to women and includes not only mental and emotional states, but the physiology of women's bodies in action daily, under stress, in youth and age.

9. An understanding of the relationship between the law and women's lives; women and the Constitution.

10. An understanding of education as an institution that has helped to change the status of women, and one that has also contributed to keeping women in their secondary place.

11. An understanding of the function of women in the family, and the function of the family in relation to the status of women; the variety of families currently possible and in history.

12. An understanding of women as part of the workforce; an understanding of women and the economy, of money and power.

13. An understanding of the relationship between women and science, and women and technology; the future of women in these areas.

14. An understanding of the relationship between women in so-called developing countries and the future of their country's development.

15. An understanding of women's organizations and social change; of the function of women in social movements, of women and war and peace.

Now that you have seen something of the content, I want to talk briefly about the institutionalization of this material. First, in the U.S., the institutionalization has occurred mainly at the level of the undergraduate collegiate curriculum, and for three reasons specific to U.S. higher education, so specific, in fact, that it would have been impossible as well as undesirable to attempt the "exportation" of the U.S. model of women's studies abroad.

In 1969, when the women's movement came to the college campuses in the U.S. there were three elements at hand for the development of women's studies where it took hold--in the curriculum. These elements were the presence of women faculty in large enough numbers at least in literature, sociology and history, the fields in which women's studies first began to offer what were then "introductory" courses; second, the presence of far larger numbers of women students, not quite half the student population in those days, but more than 40%, a proportion higher than in any other country; and third, a peculiar feature of higher education in the U.S., the system that allows students to graduate with B.A. degrees through the accumulation of passing grades in discrete courses taught by faculty who control the content of these courses autonomously.

In many instances around the globe, none of the three elements is present. But in 1970, we had not only the three elements, we had also the presence of a mass women's movement being felt on campuses. Many women's studies pioneers were already at work on research about women--Gerda Lerner in history, Alice Rossi in sociology, for example. Others like me were galvanized into research through the very practical questions of our teaching experience. Quickly, I had to find more texts by women to teach from, if I was going to fulfill my goal of teaching about women's experience. Together with many other women I began to find what we called "lost" women writers, then others found painters, then musicians. I need not tell the whole story here.

By last year, there were 432 Women's Studies Programs on campuses in the U.S., and on another 1500 campuses probably as many as a dozen different women's studies courses without the umbrella of the Program for majors, minors or graduate students. I estimate that there are some 30,000 different courses currently taught on campus.

Elsewhere in the world women's studies in practice mainly means research on women, and teaching either in graduate programs or in less formal or informal locations, in a Barbadian workshop for union stewards or for middle management executives or for school teachers, just to offer one example. In the U.S., while the research has had to develop to keep pace with the undergraduate curriculum, it is only in the last five years that we have seen the formal institutionalization of research programs into Centers for Research on Women; and then, the Centers further institutionalized into the National Council for Research on Women. During this period, that process has been underway in many countries around the globe, and though we still do not have a good list, I expect that such a list would contain at least fifty Centers for education and teaching about women in almost as many countries. Women's studies research in many countries began as a study of the status of women, and, as in India, in other Asian countries, and in the Caribbean, for example, galvanized further research and the opening of significant questions of policy, including educational policy, with regard to women.

Perhaps no single example can serve to illuminate the importance of research on women than the findings of the Indian Social Science Research Council's Committee on Women's Studies: that only in India were there fewer adult women in the population than adult males; that only in India did more female infants and children die than male infants and children.

In India, the National Conference on Women's Studies, held two years ago next month, focused as much attention on the evaluation of undergraduate and graduate curriculum as on university and institute-based research. And the Conference devoted its closing resolutions with equal fervor to an agenda for research

and to another agenda for revising the teaching curriculum. That teaching curriculum is as sexist, as male-centered as ours in the West. But the strategies for revisions must be as different as are the forms of Indian institutions. Instead of the autonomous faculty member and the fragmented curriculum, in India, as in most parts of the world, one finds mandated courses of study (not autonomous units called "courses); one finds assigned or compulsory papers that undergraduates must write for degrees. This is the system that stymied the very lively Women's Studies Committee at Oxford University when Mariam Chamberlain and I visited three years ago and put to them the question of how they could begin to move beyond their own huge voluntary seminars, of how they could break into the defined courses of study in each of the different colleges and disciplines so as to add "women" to the agenda. At Oxford, it was not a question of an individuals autonomy over a fraction of the curriculum; it was a question of papers, certificates, examinations mandated by a faculty and a whole institution, usually without a single female person, much less a feminist, in a position of authority.

Two years ago, the Indian feminists planning their national women's studies conference made the essential strategic leap. Their recommendation is, in one sense, very simple: "To remove the invisibility of women in the curriculum, the group recommended that the issues pertaining to women should be incorporated in the existing compulsory papers both at the undergraduate and post-graduate levels." (p. 64) The report is very specific from discipline to discipline: in most cases, it recommends adding a topic relevant to women to the existing topics; in others, the recommendation frankly suggests adding a new compulsory paper on women. In all cases, the emphasis is on "compulsory": that is, all students must acquire this information, not only those for whom it is interesting and vital. This is quite a different concept of educational change from the one in progress in the U.S., for example. Even if in the past decade, we have reached as many as ten or fifteen percent of women students, they are the only ones we have reached. What of all the rest? We are now talking about reforming the "mainstream" over the course of the the next 20 or 30 years, and, in some five institutions in the U.S., a course on women and/or minorities is required for graduation. But we have no vision comparable to the vision of the Indian feminists who put on the conference.

Here are some examples from the section on political science:

> In the political theory paper, the concept of women's equality, freedom and rights--along with the history thereof--should be incorporated along with the concepts of democracy, liberty and equality.

> The paper dealing with political sociology should focus on the nature of the socialization process of women, their political consciousness and political behavior.
>
> The paper concerning political thinkers should include the views of prominent thinkers on women, including Rosa Luxumberg, August Bebel, Emma Goldman. . . further, inclusion of a detailed chapter on Gandhi's views on women and family would help students understand the women question in a proper perspective...

I want to add two more examples, the first from a country in which women's studies is not a developed area, as in India or the United States, or the West generally, or the Caribbean or Japan. And it is in another context and on another educational level. The country is Thailand and I am using a document called the Development Plan for Women for the Period of Five Years, 1982-1986, prepared with the assistance of UNICEF for the Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board and the Office of the Prime Minister of Thailand. With regard to women's education, the report opens with a note about the goal "that women should have equal educational opportunity as men." But then the report adds that "in reality, there are more female illiterates than male illiterates." In 1970, seventy percent of the 4,256,424 illiterates over the age of ten were women. I quote from the report:

> The fact that there is as much as 50 percent of working women who are illiterate and semi-illiterate and that a large number of women are now taking part in supporting their family has resulted in low quality among the female work force.
>
> Social changes have enabled women to play a more active role. . . . However, almost half of the women in the work force are in disguised unemployment, creating problems. . . . Women lack basic education and skill development necessary to keep pace with economic expansion. These problems deserve consideration for the benefit of national development. (p. 3)

In the section on Specific Policy and Guidelines, the directive is repeated about the needs of women for equal educational opportunity, including such imperatives as "To accelerate the development of morality, initiative and the spirit of leadership in women by ensuring that they know and understand their rights, duty and responsibility." In the section called "Specific Strategies," two directives are devoted to women--that there should be "provision of more job opportunities. . . ." and of child care centers "so that more women can go out to work." But the only educational directive of a specific nature is also

directed to men's education, presumably because they are still the 70% who get to stay in school beyond their tenth year. Here it is, and consider what it might be like if it were addressed to women, or at least also to women:

> Promotion of men's participation in housework, encouragement of men's positive attitudes toward women, ensuring the gradual change of men's attitudes toward women in order not to cause hostility in relations between men and women, securing such change of attitudes in students through the curriculum at all levels. (italics mine) (p. 17)

This is one strategy for practice on which I'd like to conclude my portion of the program, for though it is in this case formally addressed to men, it has the potential we need for an education that might provide that hope and reality for women as well. Before I conclude, however, I'd like to mention a second example, which is quite different--from the English-speaking Caribbean.

The example is built on the sophisticated model of two collaborative enterprises, each with specific goals that instruct and complement the other, and which, together, will begin to plan still a third enterprise--focused on the collegiate graduate and undergraduate curriculum. Peggy Antrobus's WAND is the older unit that began some eight years ago to offer workshops on women out of an extra-mural program at the University of the West Indies' campus in Barbados. At the same time, WAND developed links with other women's groups in other settings throughout the Caribbean, and began a number of different projects, some focused on producing materials for use in workshops, some focused on gathering information for those materials, and some focused on the workshops themselves. Often, these took the form of what we would call continuing education programs. Functionally, WAND was doing consciousness-raising about the roles, achievement, and potential of women wherever possible: to trade union persons, to school teachers, to social workers and counselors, to middle management types, to health workers. About three years ago Joycelin Massiah, also on the same campus, began, under the auspices of the Institute for Economic and Social Research, a three-year project called Women in the Caribbean. That project has resulted in a half dozen monographs, several videotapes, other scholarly papers, and a Reader for the general public and possibly for the classroom. Last September, the project also ran a conference in which researchers reported to a broad constituency of educators, political leaders, and policy makers in the Caribbean, and researchers from most regions of the world. For more than the past year, the two projects have been planning how to continue the work of women's studies in the future: how to institutionalize the continuation of research, how to begin to

use the research both to change the education of students at all levels of the curriculum, and the curriculum of higher education, and how to continue and extend the services of WAND to the adult working population throughout the English-speaking Caribbean. It's a tall order, but it is also an example of how women's studies as educational principle, perspective and practice can begin to make a difference.

APPENDIX 3

WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT AND WOMEN'S STUDIES: AGENDA FOR THE FUTURE

by

Hanna Papanek

Senior Research Associate, Center for Asian Development Studies, Boston University

Our survival as citizens and as scholars depends on our deepened understanding of the world and on the actions we take on the basis of this understanding. As women, and as scholars studying women or practitioners taking action for women, we share this need. How should we go about meeting the challenge of an international scholarship on women that is also closely linked to practice? As our practice has come to be defined, we are most concerned with equality--with women's ability to partake of the resources a society makes available to its citizens. But we have also come to define this equality in much broader terms than simply equity between the males and females of a given social stratum or class. In both research and practice, all of us have come to be concerned with equality of opportunity for all people, not only women, and with the problems of poverty that seem to be disproportionately the problems of women.

Until now, our response to the challenge of an international scholarship on women has been very limited, for both good and bad reasons. The deficiencies of our scholarship have, in turn, limited our capacity to take effective action; action, in turn, has not sufficiently influenced scholarship.

Among the good reasons, I count the fact that the new scholarship on women, in general and in all countries where it exists, has grown out of our personal experiences, our personal concerns for equality. Yet the fact that we have made the personal so political--or, if you will, the political so dependent on the personal--has also created problems in the international arena that we will need to confront. (I discuss these a little later.) We have learned, through our personal commitment and passions, that studying women requires not only advocacy but also depth and concern for context. In the studies of women we know well, in our own societies, these qualities are increasingly reflected in the new scholarship on women. But by the same token, many of us have been reluctant to extend the reach of our scholarship to the women of societies with which we are unfamiliar. This reluctance has, on occasion, been reinforced by the complex pattern of opposition to research on women by outsiders to a particular society. The nature of this opposition will need

to be the subject of a very careful dialogue, for it limits the options of both sides. In short, to achieve an international scholarship on women, we must all learn to confront the problems of transcending personal experience and count up the costs and benefits on all sides.

This is where the educational experience of the U.S. system of education has not served us well--nor has that of other nations, but I will concentrate here on our immediate situation. A major cause for the parochial nature of women's studies in the United States--the bad reasons--lies in the overwhelmingly parochial nature of our schools and universities. They are parochial in the sense that, although the United States aspires to world leadership, we have not bothered to learn much about this world outside our boundaries. Indeed, our aspirations diminish our achievements and cloud our vision. At the present time, the failure of our educational system is further related to a preoccupation with our "image" by the national leadership and a reluctance to discuss matters of substance in the public arenas where they belong. This preoccupation with our "image" as a nation, vis-a-vis other nations, reflects a dismal incapacity to understand that intellectual connections are an indispensable element of international relations. This incapacity is reflected in equally dismal resource allocations to international studies on our campuses. Furthermore, in the 1970's widespread revulsion against the U.S. role in Vietnam led many to reject an international orientation that had developed in the 1960's through greatly increased academic and cultural exchanges and through the personal experience of young people in the Peace Corps. Today's resurgent isolationism, therefore, has depleted the capacity of our schools and universities to teach students about other societies and about international issues. Cuts in spending on education, particularly with respect to languages and humanities, have contributed to our present disastrous incapacity to learn and teach about the rest of the world. Further cuts in spending are already being talked about, particularly in those types of funding that initially supported the development of university centers of language and area studies. Neither government action, nor the frequently mentioned needs of U.S. business for knowledgeable employees, seem ready to support an increased attention to education about the world outside U.S. boundaries. to be sure, professional newsletters carry many advertisements for teachers of Japanese, but there are no other vacancies.

One result of these changes has been the growing preoccupation of academics in less favored area specializations with research on materials that already exist in our libraries--historical texts, religious scriptures, and the like--rather than with new social problems that require visits to the field and the gathering of current data. This tendency is particularly damaging to the study of women, for there are few texts directly

relevant to current issues. Concentrating on traditional texts gives an inadequate picture of the actual concerns of the women of other nations and has quite frequently led many of them to criticize such research efforts. The texts that might be more relevant--such as unpublished diaries, memoirs, and photographs hidden in family trunks--are still largely unknown in these nations, as they have been in ours, until fairly recently, and also require active efforts to locate, edit and publish.

In short, general trends in U.S. international relations and in educational policies have naturally affected women's studies. But within the last decade, efforts have also been made to broaden our scope and begin to focus on international issues in research and practice on women. Let me discuss some of the developments in varied categories of researchers and practitioners concerned with women and international issues, from my personal perspective.

Women in Area Studies

Beginning in the mid-1950's, internationally oriented activities greatly expanded on U.S. university campuses, often through the establishemnt of "area studies" centers devoted to research and teaching about non-western societies. These centers stressed language study, anthropology, history, literature and art; some included sociology, economics, geography, political science. Women graduate students began doing dissertations on women in other societies but often faced stubborn opposition from teachers or colleagues. Most decided on a woman-related topic on their own, sometimes once they were already in the field. Other researchers, including myself, began to make the study of women our central concern in the early 1970's (or even earlier), well before women's studies courses were widely established or women-in-development projects even discussed. Interest in research on women was strongest, in this early period, among women academics who specialized in research on Latin America, Africa and some parts of Asia.

In 1975, International Women's Year and the United Nations Conference in Mexico City consolidated these trends by giving some legitimacy to scattered research efforts and strengthening the establishment of academic networks. The formation of women's caucuses in international professional associations, such as the International Sociological Association, speeded up this process.

In 1976, a group of scholars drawn from the women's caucuses of three of the four major area studies associations in the United States (Association for Asian Studies, African Studies Association, Latin American Studies Association) organized the Wellesley Conference. The three area studies associations sup-

ported the conference organizers in their initial efforts and provided the model of an academic conference based on the presentation of research papers in panel sessions on specific topics, with audience participation in discussions. At the time, these women's caucuses had several hundred members; some groups had already organized earlier conferences in conjunction with overseas colleagues.

The Wellesley Conference did not include papers on women in North America or Europe, for its specific purpose had been to provide a counterweight to the many meetings that were already being held on women in these parts of the world. From the viewpoint of some overseas participants, this emphasis was a serious defect of the conference. On the whole, however, participants welcomed the opportunity to begin building links with women scholars in many parts of the world beyond the preoccupation with studies in their own countries.

As the program evolved, resources were found to invite about one-third of the 135 speakers from overseas but no one really anticipated the huge size of the conference itself. Nearly five hundred participants, including many from overseas and many temporarily in North America, came for four days of active and sometimes acrimonious discussion. Many of the major questions raised at the meetings still dominate our present concerns. What should be the relation between research and practice, theory and policy? What should be the role of researchers and practitioners working in countries of which they are not citizens? What should be the impact on scholars and practitioners of the political relations among the nations of which they are citizens?

For lack of a readily available better title, conference organizers chose the name "Women and Development" to stress its international aspects. As expected, critiques of the meaning and effects of "development" were among the major features of papers and discussions. Important insights into the problems of international scholarship on women and the building of international networks came out of these discussions at Wellesley (and a follow-up meeting at Wingspread) and remain with us. But the initial impetus for the Wellesley meetings should also be kept in mind: it was the need to focus attention on and develop closer relations with the women of other nations--a group largely neglected in teaching, research and action programs by women in North America. It was hoped that ideas and resources would be pooled for future development of what was expected to be a new and growing field in women's studies.

Yet today, the scholars who are concerned with the study of women in the broader context of their specialized research and teaching about Asian, African, Latin American, Caribbean, and Middle Eastern cultures and societies from a base in North

American universities represent one of the great neglected resources for an internationally oriented effort for women. These scholars have the specialized training in language, history, cultural and social studies, plus a strong interest in women, that should make them ideally suited to work with colleagues in women's studies and in women-in-development programs. But although there are some exceptions, this has not happened.

Instead, area studies specialists committed to women have often had to give in to the pressures of their institutions and funding agencies to shift their attention to other subject matter. Small underfunded area centers and departments generally refuse to allow a faculty member to specialize in research and teaching on women. These scholars also lack the stimulation they once hoped to find from a larger group of colleagues also interested in women but not necessarily sharing their area specialization. For reasons that I will discuss later, development-assistance agencies and organizations have also failed to take advantage of the skills and interests held by this group of scholars.

Ironically enough, all this is happening just at the moment that women's studies programs--even on the same campus--are beginning to discover the need to include the women of other nations in their research and teaching. In part, this need is fueled by the presence on U.S. campuses of growing numbers of women from other nations who have come here to study and find themselves very frustrated. In part too, greater pressures for participation and recognition of cultural traditions other than those of the dominant majority in this country come from within the women's studies movement itself.

Another source of the impetus to broaden our perspectives as activists and scholars committed to women comes from the strong emphasis on the interdisciplinary nature of the new scholarship on women. True interdisciplinary means, of course, that we cannot restrict ourselves to the women of a single place and time. The disciplines and bodies of knowledge in which we are rooted draw their strengths from many different ways of knowing--some claim universal applicability and ignore historical time or social structures, while others see no validity in anything that is not specific in space and time. It seems increasingly clear that a claim to universal applicability of knowledge about women that does not pay careful attention to empirical facts drawn from many diverse cultures and societies can only result in sterile or premature attempts at a general theory. We cannot have it both ways: arguing for a universally applicable set of explanations for the position of women while taking universal applicability as a given and, therefore, failing to take the trouble to check ideas against empirical fact. Even if we had no other reason to

support the internationalization of research and practice on women, this last point alone argues in its favor.

Women in Development: Theory and Policy

International Women's Year did not initiate a new movement--it only confirmed what women in many countries were already experiencing. Changes in the global relations among nation-states affects women's work, women's power and women's family relations. Thus the impetus given by the series of international conferences and action programs legitimized what had already begun to happen and gave concerned people some of the means to proceed.

With respect to issues linking women with the development process, Ester Boserup's landmark book, Women's Role in Economic Development (first published in English in 1970 and since translated into several languages) has become something of a symbol of our awareness of the varied effects of change and development on women. Her ideas have been incorporated into much later work; they have also been challenged. Ironically, in spite of the book's wide popularity, the research agenda she outlined for systematic data collection and analysis by national governments and international agencies has been slow in being followed. Later critiques of the effects of development on women, contained in much of the research stimulated by the UN Conference, emphasized the adverse effects, whether intended or unintended, particularly on poor and uneducated women. Governments and international agencies, concerned by the lack of effectiveness of any conventional development programs, began to add women's projects to the mix. Development-assistance institutions and organizations also began to use a new rhetoric with regard to women. On occasion, the rhetoric has been accompanied by significant institutional changes and resource allocations--but these are not nearly as large as the rhetoric sometimes seems to suggest. This can work to our disadvantage.

Let me now concentrate briefly on some direct effects of these changes on the relationships--within the United States--among the various groups and categories of people concerned with women's equity. This includes practitioners and researchers in development-assistance organizations; academic researchers, teachers and students concerned with international issues and women and the broader women's studies community. Most of these people are women but a small and significant number are men.

The formation in 1982 of the new Association of Women in Development (AWID) has put these relationships into a somewhat sharper focus than before. It would appear, at this time, that the members of AWID represent a significant portion of the action or practice element in internationally oriented efforts for

women's equity. For this reason, it is particularly important to examine the relation between theory and practice in this field, between research and action.

In its initial organizational efforts, AWID has drawn on several major groupings: persons concerned with women and development issues in development-assistance agencies of the U.S. government, in private voluntary agencies in development-assistance work (funded by private contributions plus, in some cases, grants from USAID) and on the faculties or administrative staffs of some U.S. universities (primarily, but not exclusively, Title XII land-grant institutions). Precursors of AWID include the regional networks funded by USAID's office for Women in Development. These networks have often succeeded in forging links among concerned women otherwise isolated on their campuses and within professional associations in disciplines relevant to development issues (particularly in agriculture and natural resources). In the private voluntary agencies, staff members concerned with women's issues have often played leading roles in putting women's projects into the assistance portfolios of their organizations and in stimulating the attention of donors to the problems faced by poor women in low-income countries.

Given existing relationships, and given the dependence of Title XII universities on U.S. government research funding--especially in Schools of Agriculture and Home Economics--and also given the existence of the Percy Amendment that mandates attention to women in development, a strategy focused on inserting women into existing research and action projects in development assistance promises to be very effective. Project design can be improved by including women as beneficiaries. Project performance can be raised if the people actually doing much of the agricultural work are also addressed. In addition, the inclusion of women faculty, research staff, and graduate students in large on-going projects in their institutions obviously also improves their positions within the university.

In the long run, however, AWID's present emphasis on only one sector of the larger community concerned with women and international issues is not without its problems. It seems to me that stressing the distinction between persons concerned with policy or action and those who teach and do research <u>on the same set of issues</u> makes it harder to develop the solid infrastructure of ideas and experience on which we are all dependent. This is particularly serious with respect to women and development issues because there are not many of us and we have often faced serious opposition. Indeed, I feel sure that some of the resistance to a more thorough integration of women into development policies and projects comes at least in part from a failure to present cogent arguments in terms of national and global development policies. It is in this connection that that failure to develop a unified

knowledge base for understanding and action on these issues has been most damaging.

Obviously, distinctions between "theory" and "policy" orientations are well known in the development community and not confined to women's issues. I happen to think that the gulf seems harder to bridge with respect to women-in-development issues than otherwise. In the larger development community, there is a fair amount of mobility and communication, in spite of the very serious bureaucratic institutional barriers. Many male researchers and teachers in academic institutions spend time working with action and policy agencies on development programs and projects. As a result, they teach more effectively and have more to offer students who come to U.S. institutions from abroad. U.S. students can gain a view of global realities more readily from people with this experience. In short, while the boundaries exist, they seem to be somewhat permeable.

After all, many of the innovative ideas in various fields of development have also grown out of very practical, policy-oriented research programs--in effect, the more theoretical work was "sneaked into" the ostensibly policy-oriented work in which people were engaged. It seems to me that there is not yet enough activity of this kind with regard to women and development. Action and policy-oriented studies tend to be designed in ways that do not encourage the introduction of more theoretical considerations. Critical or theoretical work, by contrast, often suffers from a lack of current empirical data or field experience.

Times have changed, of course, since the early days of applied economic research and fertility studies. We face new conditions in our work. The most crucial and the most encouraging of these new conditions is the extent to which collaboration is possible among women in many countries. Partly as a result of new consciousness of these issues, partly as a side-effect of the rising labor force participation of highly educated women, there are now growing numbers of women in development-assistance institutions and organizations. This includes private voluntary organizations, international and bilateral aid agencies, and many governments, some of which have also instituted special "women's ministries" or similar agencies. This increase in the presence of women should place special emphasis on the development of international collaborative relations among women engaged in research and action for women's equity. The participation of women students, now doing graduate work in the U.S. and other countries foreign to them, will be an important factor in the development of international collaborative networks.

In the field of women's studies, on the other hand, there has been less effort to develop international dimensions, at least in the United States, for reasons that have more to do with

the personal and political issues of the women's movement in this country than with the intrinsic merits of the internationalization of women's studies. This is a point to which I will return later.

Power and Institutions

The question of power comes up repeatedly in considering these matters--as it has a tendency to do where women's interests are concerned. What is fundamentally at issue in the various divisions and distinctions I emphasize in this presentation is the nature of power and the workings of institutions. This includes the power of institutions to make resource allocations among competing claimants and the power of women in institutions.

There is also a power outside institutions--and one kind of power is too often neglected in current women-and-development efforts. That is the power to persuade--through the written word, in newspapers and journals, in professional conferences, and in informal discussions with opponents and colleagues--and it is a power that independent scholars are in a position to exercise effectively. Perhaps because women in this country are unused to institutional power, and therefore preoccupied with obtaining it, we have often failed to use the power of persuasion that might be exercised in this connection by scholars and writers.

Institutional power is another matter. Any policy decision, any action commitment by an institution that has resources to distribute has the potential to affect the position of one individual or group relative to another. That is what makes them such tempting targets for transformation by persons with new ideas; it is also what makes them feared and hated. But answers relevant to the impact of institutional power on the lives of competing claimants for their resources do--and should--preoccupy many of the people working in the field of women and development. Private voluntary organizations, for example, spend much staff time on answering the question "whom are we helping?" and some time (not nearly enough!) on discussing "whom should we be helping?" Staff members spend time in the field working on project proposals to find answers; they argue with project review committees and shepherd proposals through the organization on the basis of these answers. All of these activities are clearly related to power and powerlessness--and to assumptions about the capacity of institutions to affect the power balance through some action, some "intervention," some transfer of resources.

Within institutions, for example, in development assistance, staff members working on women's issues are often among the youngest and least powerful participants in large hierarchies.

People low on the organizational totem pole can rarely afford to take risks, particularly if they can then be criticized for trying to advance the self-interest of a group to which they also belong. This has both advantages and severe disadvantages. As experience has shown, successful changes in the policies of institutions engaged in development assistance with respect to women have resulted from very skillful organizational politics by insiders--a process often agonizingly slow and time-consuming.

Outsiders may have no role in this process or even a negative one. For example, a person coming from outside the institution or organization may be eager to speed up the process of institutional persuasion by offering to contribute critical research or new ideas. Yet for the staff member, such an outsider is potentially a "loose cannon on deck" as a collaborator, for she could potentially jeopardize the staff person's slow and careful work inside. By contrast, men in senior positions can more readily afford to invite some critical appraisals by outsiders or take a chance on supporting a project that may or may not work well. Less powerful staff members must be more cautious and, in any case, have fewer resources at their command.

The particular nature of women's programs and projects also involves many thorny issues of power that often transcend questions of institutional power just mentioned. Although the desirability of women-in-development projects is often discussed in highly personal terms that reveal a distressing amount of personal prejudice in both the U.S. and elsewhere, I am sure that the issue of power relations is equally, if not more, crucial.

For example, projects designed to enhance the income-earning opportunities of poor rural women have at least the potential side effect of lessening income differentials. Since middle and upper-class families are among the employers of poor rural women in low-income jobs, alternative earning opportunities could affect the supply of female labor--provided that enough new and better jobs were created by the project.

To give another example, specialized women's ministries in some new countries depend very heavily on existing women's associations for the implementation of programs and on political patronage to gain support within their government. While women's associations in many countries have very impressive records in fighting for women's educational and legal rights, the newer types of income-generating projects for poor women are relatively new for many such groups. The grass-roots, participatory style of some development projects by private voluntary organizations is also unfamiliar and may be seen as threatening existing power relations in some nations. Yet there is again a tendency to phrase opposition to some women's projects in personalized terms that focus on women's role in the family and culture.

In actual fact, of course, women's projects--even if they increase women's access to new income-earning opportunities--have a far smaller effect on culture and social order, including the family, than some other innovations. I am convinced, for example, that the single most powerful factor in changing the division of labor and relations between women and men can be the introduction of a new seed variety, with its attendant demands for new cultivation methods, cash for new inputs like fertilizer, and a need to develop new marketing methods. Yet I have never heard anyone mention the effect of new seed varieties on male-female relations or the stability of the traditional family.

Academic researchers can often gain a very different view of a situation if they are working independently. Indeed, many have achieved impressive rapport with particular groups, often among the very poor and powerless, that is sometimes equalled by workers in private voluntary associations but rarely by persons working through official channels. It is the independence of some academic researchers that makes their relations with official development-assistance agencies often problematic and may constitute an additional element in the tensions between the two groups.

In the first instance, however, tensions and misunderstandings between academics and persons in development-assistance institutions arise most often because of the differences between them in terms of goals and constraints. While academic researchers on women in other countries are sometimes actively involved in women's advocacy efforts, their professional activities generally do not emphasize recommendations for action or project design but the collection and analysis of data on a broad range of issues affecting women. For project workers looking for answers to very specific questions, academic research reports may appear infuriatingly irrelevant at first glance and be put aside. Similarly, academics often dismiss the baseline research of project or policy researchers as too superficial and too constrained by institutional requirements to come up with quick recommendations for concrete action.

There is obviously a <u>division of labor</u> here, rather than a <u>conflict of interests</u>--but in the underfunded arena of women-in-development work, it is sometimes difficult to see the difference. This leads to tensions that divide us instead of alliances that unite us. The tensions between what one of my friends likes to call "Boston" and "Washington"--the academic and policy worlds--are of an institutional, rather than a personal, sort. This suggest to me that they reflect the real success of institutional policies that serve to marginalize women and try to contain change by making minority groups the watchdogs of their own progress without genuine institutional commitments.

Developing Common Ground

At this point in our intellectual and practical development as a group of people concerned with women's equity in both poor and affluent nations, we have relatively little formal ground on which to stand together. Like any critic, I have probably exaggerated divisions and fissures in order to make my point. But I think it is true that we cannot--yet--lay claim to shared theoretical frameworks or paradigms for change.

A common ground of theory and policy is not the same thing as consensus. Given the importance of the fundamental issues we address, I think that consensus is unlikely. It is also undesirable, for our vitality depends on continued discussion of very different alternatives--and even that discussion is often broken off or undercut because the institutional preconditions for exchange do not exist.

Many people who are also concerned with development, in many parts of the world, do not really understand what we are talking about--beyond the simple rhetoric that one must now pay attention to women. As we all know, this is usually interpreted in terms of simple self-interest, of giving in to the pressures of advocacy groups. Only very rarely, it seems to me, have we succeeded in breaking through to common ground.

I once asked a group of development economists in a European agency for development assistance why they have not turned their attention to women, given their commitment to agricultural growth in countries with many women farmers. One of them said thoughtfully that they did not quite know how to proceed on that question. There were so few women on their staff. After a pause I asked: "How many of you are peasants?" It seemed that not one of them had come from a rural farm background. This did not appear to deter them from working on international agriculture.

Similarly, of course, the new information on women and development does not require special life experiences to be understood and utilized in development research and planning. To be sure, some action projects and some field research efforts with women require women staff--to gain access and rapport, to highlight questions of which one is already conscious. It is also a good thing to assure female participation in the process of research and planning, for reasons of power, if nothing else. But once the data are available, why should it then require a heightened consciousness of personal problems to pay attention to them? Anyone should be able to use them, yet they are routinely assigned to the province of women researchers, scholars, policy analysts, many of whom also seek these assignments because of their established interest.

I think what is happening here should be called "false specialization"--assigning a special niche to data that do not require it and to researchers who have not asked for it--simply in order to slow down the process of change. The world of science contains many examples of false specialization and I am sure it has proved very handy in universities and research institutions.

But false specialization can also be stood on its head. We can respond by making gender distinctions so central to all our work--in both theory and policy--in terms that reflect the preoccupations of others as well as our own that it will be harder to ignore us.

This requires the development of the common ground we occupy--making it not only available but also useful to both practitioners and academics, policy-oriented researchers and program implementers. At this point in our intellectual and practical development as a group of people concerned with women's equity in both affluent and poor nations, however, we do not yet have enough common ground on which to stand together.

We cannot--yet--lay claim to shared theoretical frameworks or to common formats in which to argue out our differences. We also cannot--yet--dip into a common pool of shared knowledge. We do not have the journals, the library collections, the data bases, the common language that speeds communication and the accumulation of knowledge. What we do have is conferences and conference volumes--good for rapid communication of new ideas but not for slow accumulation of generalizable conclusions. We also have many, many bibliographies. Again, these may fulfill the purpose of convincing doubters that yes, there is something about women in development, or make the life of the harried report-writer a little easier. But bibliographies are no better than the libraries or data-sets to which they should readily led us. They are no substitute for regular journals or other, regular, established modes of professional communication. Bibliographies of ephemeral, unpublished material may be interesting but they are also wildly frustrating to anyone who wants to use them in longer-range research. And finally, we also have special issues of journals, devoted to women and development--useful for raising the consciousness of those who have still not heard us.

It is plain, in short, that there exists a huge pool of information, brought together by much careful thought by many devoted people. I often think of this new body of information as a new underground literature--a new kind of samizdat--that circulates through personal networks rather than on the open marketplace of intellectual exchange. Indeed, I devote considerable time and effort to keeping my own collection up to date and lending it to students or colleagues. Yet the fact that per-

sonal networks are so important in gaining access to our common knowledge also reinforces our status as a falsely specialized community. People who might make important new contributions cannot have easy access to existing knowledge--the new graduate students who might become interested, the isolated colleagues who have developed some of their own ideas, the staff member of an institution who has some new thoughts, all of these must first get into a new network and cannot really dip into our shared knowledge independently. This is an additional reason why the fissions and tensions I have described are so destructive to our progress.

At present, I think it is unlikely that development-assistance institutions and organizations can be persuaded of the importance of building a solid infrastructure of knowledge about women and development beyond what they have already undertken by way of projects, research fellowships, and partial data-bases. All of these have been useful. They are not enough for what I think we really need. It is also not really the functions of these institutions.

Above all, the universities have failed us, not only in the U.S. but on a global scale. As far as I know, there is not a single major research institute or university center devoted to development-related research and teaching that has included some women-in-development activities fully in its program. At best, some research institutions have devoted temporary time or partial resources; none, so far as I know, has made a serious commitment at a senior level to work on this topic. Given the commitment of considerable resources to women's studies in the U.S., for example, this failure on the part of universities is particularly striking.

In this respect, I do not think we have aimed nearly high enough. By focusing our energies on internal institutional changes to achieve the integration of "women's components" into larger programs, for instance, we may have overlooked ways that might have been more persuasive of the merits of our case. Let me take one example of a major policy issue in which more careful attention to women might greatly improve understanding and suggest policy changes. Questions of income distribution, employment, and class differences are enormously important, especially in low-income countries, where they are not only economically but also politically explosive.

Most of the analysis of these issues concentrates on male employment; if women are considered at all, it is in a very marginal sense. Yet readily available data from many countries make it possible, by now, to develop some very different views of on-going processes by the more careful inclusion of data on women. Several points stand out. For one thing, patterns of

female labor utilization are changing: growing numbers of educated women are going into modern-sector jobs, often newly created, while at the same time uneducated women are often displaced by technological innovations. The composition of the female labor force, therefore, is changing in terms of educational qualifications and the class background of women workers. Second, poor women must usually continue to work because they and their families need their income; often, these are female-headed households or at least dependent on the women's earnings. But when customary work is no longer available, women work in the informal sector or under illegal conditions and are no longer officially enumerated as "economically active." Third, research supports the commonsense notion that poorer families--entirely dependent on their labor--are proportionately more dependent on women's earnings than is true, on the average, for middle and upper income families who also control other resources.

In short, when the true economic activities of women are factored into the analysis of employment and income distribution, it becomes a little easier to see why class differences may be increasing and why income distribution may be more unequal in some situations than before. The inclusion of women then also makes it possible to develop more relevant policy choices that include both men and women in the equation.

Of course, this is a quick sketch and an overgeneralization of some very important global trends. But taken in the more general context of ideas held by many development analysts and planners, this sketch also illustrates some of the lines of policy-relevant theorizing that might make our ideas more relevant to this larger community. Stated in these terms, the argument becomes more familiar and also more cogent to the concerns of policy-oriented development thinkers. In many discussions, I have found them bored by talk of "women's components" in larger projects, for these are concessions some of them have made long ago in response to what they see as simple advocacy pressure. The more general theorizing, moreover, is much harder to marginalize because it touches on so many central concerns of these planners themselves.

This is what I mean by turning false specialization on its head. Having made gender distinctions central to our work in both practice and theory, we are better prepared to tackle general questions that remain baffling and refractory to conventional analysis. Of course, I will not pretend that there exists a detailed trajectory for such an ambitious proposal but I am convinced it is worth placing on our agenda for the future.

The Personal is Political: Internationalizing Women's Studies

Let me end this presentation with some personal observations of feminist scholarship and women's studies in the United States, about which I have said very little.

As I mentioned at the outset, the conviction that "the personal is political" has played a major role in mobilizing our women's movements by fueling advocacy efforts and contributing to deeply creative scholarship. This same conviction now causes problems both in the internationalization of feminist scholarship and development of feminist theory and practice. I think we must admit that not everything that is political is necessarily also personal. Not everything that is personal is necessarily also political.

In women's studies, both here and abroad, much that has been written has served to validate personal experience. Many things have been "named." Many inequalities have been "counted." Validation of personal experience can be exhilarating--freeing one to think and say things one never knew in quite the same way before.

But there are other things that cannot be known in the same way. That is why I think we must also find ways to transcend personal experience. The failure to do so could lead us down a dead-end road and here I am not speaking of the failure of empathy but of an intellectual turning inward that could spell the end of feminist scholarship.

In one of her last published articles, the late Shelley Rosaldo wrote as an anthropologist that the trend toward universalism still pervading the social disciplines was a heritage from Victorian times that we must learn to do without. Some of our best scholars have universalized the particular, have spoken of the experience of all women with a passion deeply rooted in personal knowledge. This too has been an exhilarating intellectual experience.

But we must also learn to find ways to admit that such knowledge can be both limited and limiting. Social researchers, however gifted, cannot reach universal conclusions from a limited data base. In talking about feminist scholarship and the future, I think we can argue from a position of strength that we do not need grand universal statements to make convincing points about specific issues. We will be more readily understood, I think, if we base our conclusions on concrete empirical findings in particular settings. That, in turn, will enable us to develop the paradigms and theories that now appear fragmentary and unconvincing.

As a matter of fact, I expect that new paradigms based on

gender as a central variable can transform the existing social discipline in a very fundamental way. In order to achieve this transformation, we will need to argue our case--perhaps unfortunately, perhaps not--in the terms that can be readily understood in the existing social disciplines, and not in a newly invented language of our own choosing. That again makes concrete empirical findings so important and argues against premature theorizing.

This is also where the internationalizing of women's studies can become very important--in moving us beyond the validation of personal experience to the exploration of very different truths. We cannot achieve this without active collaboration with our colleagues in different countries. I stress collaboration because the ambitious goals that I think we need to set for ourselves cannot be achieved in any single society or culture alone. We may need a female de Tocqueville from India to tell us about ourselves and begin a dialogue about women in the United States--just as those of us who have worked in South Asia need a continuing dialogue with our South Asian colleagues. Both Insider and Outsider views have a role to play in the social disciplines. In our eagerness to accord validity to many different cultural perspectives, we cannot forget that insight.

It may well be the most difficult thing we have ever tried to do but many of the materials for the job are at hand. Let me be concrete. In India, for example, women are a hot topic--books, articles, conferences and other forms of expression bring women's issues before the public. According to my quick count, nearly one hundred articles per year were published in Indian newspapers, periodicals, and journals in 1979, 1980 and 1981. This interest has probably increased since then. Many books about women have been published in India's very active publishing industry, which also has good links with distributors in North America. Under an acquisitions program sponsored by the various governments involved, the U.S. Library of Congress selects and sends to participating U.S. libraries new publications from the countries of South Asia (and several other regions, as well). In 1981, this program sent nearly fifty books and monographs relating to women in South Asia to participating libraries; two-thirds of these were in English and nearly half were published in India. In other words, published materials on women in South Asia are available in the U.S.; to guide scholarly research, some excellent bibliographies are also available. Even though South Asia scholars in the U.S. have not generally paid much attention to these materials, several of the women in area studies that I discussed at the outset have maintained a strong interest in research on women.

Internationalizing women's studies in the U.S. will also be helped--perhaps paradoxically--by the conscious decisions of some

of our colleagues in other countries to concentrate their energies in the first instance on developing their national resources. For more than a decade, Indian scholars and feminist activists have focused their efforts on documenting women's inequality, stimulating political and legal action, and developing local programs of education and income-generation for women. As one of the leaders of this effort has noted, they initially followed a strategy of using only materials by Indian researchers to make their points--a "self-denying ordinance," as they called it, to emphasize the role of insiders. With the founding of the Indian Association of Women Studies, such a strategy may be unnecessary; in any event, efforts are now under way in several institutions to strengthen the bonds between Indian feminist scholars and those in other countries, both within and outside Asia. These efforts will provide a model for the development of international comparative research and teaching in women's studies.

Two very concrete recommendations for introducing a more international orientation into women's studies in the United States bring me back to my original starting point. First, and most important, materials and perspectives from other cultures and societies need to be integrated topically into whatever we are studying or teaching about women, instead of being segregated into a distant corner of the course or curriculum. The challenge of this method is to minimize the distinction between Us and Them while also stressing differences in culture, social structure, and individual points of view. Courses on images of women, for example, could deal with materials from, say, Japan, India, Italy, France, Tanzania, Morocco, Argentina, along with materials from North America. With some imaginative searching, I believe that relevant materials are available from all these places on the basis of recent studies by women scholars. In the social sciences, to give another example, materials on female migration, labor force participation, political activities, occupational segregation, role in peasant agriculture--to give only a few obvious examples--are available from a large number of sources, mostly although not exclusively, in English. Here the impact of international emphasis on women-in-development programs has made itself felt in data collection and research reports.

Second, and perhaps more difficult, I think it will be crucial to achieve the integration of a focus on women in the work of existing centers of international studies, economic development and area studies. This again brings us back to women-in-development efforts to integrate women's projects into those activities on U.S. campuses related to development-assistance projects. If any efforts have been successful to introduce an emphasis on women into these internationally oriented research and teaching enterprises, it has largely been due to the USAID-related networks. All the more reason, therefore, to

stress the importance of closer relations with women's studies on the same campus. One problem is obvious: international studies occupy the same isolated position on many U.S. campuses that women's studies programs are all too familiar with. While it is difficult to link two marginal enterprises, it may not be impossible.

I have stressed differences among us and difficulties. In closing let me emphasize the major reason for a stronger international orientation in feminist scholarship and practice. I see signs, in our conferences and in some of our major publication outlets in feminist studies, of the development of highly specialized modes of thought and communication. Ideas are becoming less and less accessible to persons working in different intellectual traditions--yet one of the great strengths of feminist scholarship in the past has been its open communication among many disciplines and between theory and practice. I am afraid this openness is breaking down. If so, we will find fewer and fewer of us and we will be talking only to ourselves. The major contribution feminist awareness has made to our lives is to emphasize, over and over again, the realities of women's lives--all sorts of women, all over the world. We need to know this world as if it were our own, yet knowing that only a small part of it is ours. Others do not know us very well, either, so this must be a collective enterprise. And while there may be some utility to separate paths, to some division of labor among us, we need to keep our common interests in view at all times. We must not allow ourselves to be assigned to false specializations in which women are removed from their social context, their place in time and space, and where we become--once again--isolated objects of specialized attention. For that is not the road towards equality.

APPENDIX 4

COMMENT ON TWO PERSPECTIVES

by

Nadia Youssef

Senior Policy Specialist on Women's Participation
in Economic Activities and Basic Services, UNICEF
and former Director of Research, International
Center for Research on Women

Let me begin by saying that it is difficult for me to be completely neutral in this task before me--which is to comment on the two perspectives that have just been expounded.

I see some commonalities between the central principles of the women's studies and the women-in-development perspectives, and many differences. It is the strength of the differences that, in my opinion, make the two irreconcilable.

Let us begin with the commonalities:

- Both grew out of the Feminist Movement
- Both are grounded in a commitment to improve the condition of women
- Neither is a value free (neutral) subdiscipline
- Intrinsic to both is a commitment to a certain cause which we are conscious of and which we know "defines" the issues we research, the areas of inquiry we select to investigate and the type of probing we advocate.
- Both have the potential of organizing women (and men)

As to the differences between the two perspectives, these have been articulated by the two previous speakers in implicit and explicit forms, though I many not agree fully with the characterization of the differences as these were expounded. For example, the notion of women-in-development professionals being practitioners and women's studies protagonists being academics is foreign to me. The bulk of the women-in-development theoretical perspectives--and the serious research on this issue--can be traced to academics. I think that a distinction along those lines does us all a disservice. The strength of the two

disciplines is precisely that they contain both elements of academics and practitioners, rather than being polarized along these lines.

The question of differences between the two perspectives raises the possibility of complementarity--this notion has surfaced in some implicit form in the presentations of Florence Howe and Hanna Papanek--and may necessitate further exploration. My contention is that the two perspectives carry different agendas, are intended for and of interest to two different audiences and that their relative importance to women's lives has to be understood and situated in the context of historical differences and class circumstances.

With this to serve as background to my intellectual biases, I would like to take the time allocated to me to:

1. expound in more detail on the differences by characterizing what women in development is all about;

2. raise the distinction between "ethical neutrality" on the one hand and "commitment" to a cause, on the other hand, in the context of academic performance; and in light of this,

3. speak about the role/responsibility of the academic involved in women-in-development related research and field work.

1. Basic Differences Between The Two Perspectives

As a discipline that combines theory and practice in combined or separate form, women in development focuses on the developing world. Its central organizing principle is the "development process"--in terms of the social and economic transformation that this process is bringing about. Specifically we ask ourselves:

- How does this process affect women in a manner that is different from men?

and

- What is the differential impact of such a transformation under different historical epochs and societal specific circumstances?

I elaborate on this point to underline two basic differences between the two disciplines. To begin with:

a) The focus of women-in-development extends beyond feminist concerns--its context is not solely male/female discrimination but the entire social, economic and political changes affecting developing economies. Within such a framework is the recognition that women's role and status is often nationalistically rather than individualistically based and that boundaries as to the direction of changes in women's lives are often set by national development goals rather than by self-realization and self-actualization aspirations, though in the long run one may affect the other.

b) Women-in-development has a class oriented focus--in that it concentrates on the conditions of groups in poverty--since this is the group that bears the brunt of the consequences of economic change.

Given the importance of (a) and (b) it becomes difficult from a women and development perspective to accept cardinal principles of the Women's Studies movement such as have been presented here. To cite but a few:

i) patriarchy being the root cause of the subordinate status of women;

ii) the universal/historical domination of men over women being the sole oppressor and responsible for preventing women from achieving full human potential.

The operationalization of oppression in such terms as sex discrimination is too simplistic an explanation for what is happening to women in the midst of social and economic transformation (in Florence's view, this would make us "conservative feminists"). In speaking of women's condition in the third world today, there is not much room to talk of making women "aware of options" as in the West; instead we have to begin to create options. Terms such as "dignity of employment" are irrelevant--men themselves do not have that dignity. It makes sense in feminist terms to talk of women's need for higher education. In developing economies, however, where women do obtain higher education, the gap between poor and rich women widens even further.

As seen by development-oriented thinkers and doers, the root of the problems of poor women (and men) in developing countries lies in

- class factors
- economic systems and choices of technologies
- political systems - interdependency/dependency
- colonial heritage, etc.

in combination with existent discriminatory practices against women buttressed by culture and reinforced by cultural forces. By concerning ourselves with historical and cultural origins of male/female discrimination, we fail to address the structural constraints that are more amenable to policy intervention.

Secondly, the two perspectives differ in that they attract different audiences. Women's Studies tends to be inhabited by academics, advocates, and activists. The Women in Development field engages a larger audience of participants:

a) The academic community participates insofar that the subject matter is being taught in some departments throughout the country and that academics are often called upon to contribute research and/or perform as consultants/experts in teams sent out to design/evaluate aid projects related to women in third world countries.

b) Policy oriented researchers (outside of the academic community) participate.

c) Feminists of different ideological persuasions who may either be directly involved in research or project design participate, or may be part of important pressure groups to influence the trend and funding of research in this field.

d) Policy makers participate in the applied aspects of the women and development field.

2. Ethical Neutrality Vs. Commitment to Women-in-Development Field

The participation of different layers in the women-in-development movement has not been without problems. I refer in particular to the lack of accommodation between the Ivory Tower researchers, those committed to the cause of women, and the policymaker.

Most of us come from solid academic backgrounds but we do not find this to interfere with our commitment to women. That is to say, we do not have to compromise our academic integrity to our commitment. But there are social scientists recruited by international/national agencies into research and planning functions who profess to be "ethically neutral", "value-free" and often not policy-oriented. These academics are placed in positions where they are able through the reporting of their findings or the recommendations they make to negatively affect the lives of hundreds of thousands of women, precisely because they are not committed to women or to action.

We cannot afford at this or any point in time to have "ethically neutral" social scientists play with the lives of women. We need academic researchers who are first of all committed to the formulation of policy (policy-oriented researchers) and secondly we need those men and women who are committed to women in poverty. This obviously means social scientists who are not "value-free", who direct their research in a manner that is intended to focus upon specific issues considered to be priorities, and who report results with policy implementation in mind. It is of course debatable whether there exists such a thing as the role of objective (value-free) social scientist, because our values enter into the manner in which we pose research questions. Our ethical decisions are the products of broader values and belief systems whether these stem from the scientific community, from particular ideologies, or whatever.

But what is the importance of commitment in operational terms, you might ask? Let us begin by research. If one is doing research on the subject of women in development, this commitment to women, or to social justice, or to human rights (which includes women) will necessarily intervene in the way a research problem is framed, the perspective adopted, the theoretical propositions made and the formulation of hypotheses proposed. The interpretation of findings will reflect that perspective. Likewise, with respect to the participation of academics in project design, "commitment" to women on the part of the social scientist is equally crucial.

It is simplistic to believe that the solution is to send design teams overseas that only include women. Because of local customs and seclusion, a man may have difficulty establishing communication with women in villages and poor urban areas. In that sense the presence of women in the team can be an advantage. But this should not automatically make us assume that women social scientists are necessarily committed to women and/or to the poor.

3. The Social Responsibility of the Social Scientist

It is precisely with respect to this issue of objectivity versus commitment that a great deal of ambivalence exists in my mind regarding the appropriate role of social scientists in policy formulation. The crux of the problem is, as I said earlier, that many academics (women and men) are brought into the research process on women and development, are incorporated into teams as "experts" and sent overseas to identify and design development projects in rural and urban areas. Some of these are integrated projects, some are women-specific projects.

Many of these academics are objective social scientists, highly skilled in theories and conceptualization issues; they are in many instances not concerned about the use of knowledge for practical purposes. They are not committed to women in general, or to the integration of women into development processes, in particular. The results they present in their studies and reports, because they are disinterested in women and value free, often carry the potential of discrediting plans that may have been envisaged and fought hard for to promote support for women.

I am not here advocating that social scientists engage in the manipulation of data, misrepresentation of facts, or downright dishonest reporting. I am saying that if a cause is at stake and I feel that one is at stake with respect to women in third world countries, there is a difference in the investigative process pursued by the value-free, non-policy-oriented individual and the non-value-free policy-oriented researcher, even when both adhere to strict professional standards. This difference in orientation is reflected in the very definition of a research issue, the unit of analysis chosen, the propositional statements and hypothesis formulation. Furthermore, I am saying that once the academic is brought into the development field, he/she should assume a sense of social responsibility in what they say or write.

Bureaucrats and policy makers complain that academic researchers, in particular social scientists, live in an ivory tower, are too eclectic, and notorious for not taking sides with any issue, that is, not taking a stand. This is sad because the researcher from the academic community carries a great amount of power insofar as her/his presentation of results is concerned. This is why it is particularly crucial that such researchers be aware of their roles and responsibilities, because what they report and publish often affects people's lives.

The manner in which research findings are reported and the way a research is designed may affect the policy maker's process of interpretation and evaluation. Most policy makers read only the summary statement of a lengthy research report. Most of the

findings, particularly when taken out of context or reported in
an ambiguous way, can easily reinforce whatever biased attitude
policy makers already have on the matter of women, and lead to
the articulation of policy that is reactionary to women's cause.
Research findings that are not focused on any but theoretical
issues that tend to be highly descriptive and in no way suggest
the need to single out certain populations, priorities, etc. for
intervention and action are easily dismissed as irrelevant. The
policy maker will not engage in analyzing such findings and
translating them into action.

For this it is critical that we "educate" the academic com-
munity into the importance of assuming social responsibility for
the work they undertake--the path from there to commitment to
women should not be too far away. . . .

APPENDIX 5

WORKSHOP LEADERS GUIDELINES

After introductory remarks by the conference sponsors, the morning session will be devoted to presentations by Florence Howe and Hanna Papanek on the theme, "Women and Development: Theory and Practice." A response will be made to their papers by Nadia Youssef.

From 1:45 to 3:45 the 75 participants will attend workshops (for which they have registered in advance), each of which will be led jointly by a theorist and a practitioner bringing their different perspectives to the issues. Workshop leaders may choose to make a few opening comments before presenting the questions or issues around which the workshop discussion will center. Each pair of workshop leaders is asked to prepare in advance a few questions pertinent to their topic that will provide maximum discussion by participants, keeping in mind the conference theme. The following questions are suggested merely as guidelines for the questions you will develop:

Women and Work - How should "work" be defined as related to women in development?

Women and Fertility Control - How can optimum choices be made by women about fertility control? How are the decisions effected and by whom?

A rapporteur has been assigned to each workshop and we ask leaders to cooperate with her or him in summarizing briefly (1 page) the workshop discussion. The final report on the conference will include an analysis of these summaries.

APPENDIX 6

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY SUSAN LEES

The conference organizers, Mariam Chamberlain, Marion F. Levy and I made a special effort to balance participation by people from the academic community on the one hand, and people from development agencies on the other. Our objective is to bring them together to talk over some of their common interests and to discuss their different points of view.

We anticipate then that there will be some differences. It would be surprising, even disappointing, if there are none. Many of these differences arise, I suspect, from the nature of differences between our "jobs" as we understand them. Those of us who are identified as "academics" may feel that the task before us, when we do field research, for example, is to describe and explain women's conditions in the locality under study. We look at the consequences of previous events and conditions, and try to account for them in terms of general theories that exist, or that we are hoping to develop. Those of us from the so-called "practitioner" community are faced with rather different problems. We have to create conditions and solve practical problems, not just analyze causes. To be certain, there is some overlap. As practitioners, we also draw from theoretical explanations at times, though sometimes we are not so explicit about our theoretical assumptions. In any case, it is generally our jobs to act.

In taking actions, we might well wish that some unencumbered academic research had provided us with certain types of useful information. But, more often than not, this ideal researcher has not thought of looking at questions in terms that would be useful to practitioners. Why not? A lot of academic researchers simply have no idea of what practitioners are doing in their work and what they need to know. If such a researcher were asked her advice, it is fairly likely that she would be ill-equipped to give it because she would not know how to be useful. On the other hand, we might also ask if there are better ways for practitioners to mine the information she does have.

Our afternoon workshops provide us with an opportunity to ask these questions with reference to specific issues of concern to us. It is useful for us to start by sharing our practical field experiences - what we were trying to achieve, what did we actually do - and to explore in detail the issues about which we are likely to have some differences in perspective. We also, in these workshops, will raise some open, unresolved questions on which we can examine our different views.

With the help of the focus provided by our morning speakers and of our different workshop leaders, we can open some channels to be more helpful in the different kinds of work we do and can pinpoint some areas for future discussions and cooperative work.

APPENDIX 7

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MARIAM CHAMBERLAIN

On behalf of the National Council for Research on Women, I would like to echo Donna Shalala's words of welcome.

The National Council, as some of you may know, is based at Hunter College, thanks to Donna. More specifically, we are -- or will be -- based here at Roosevelt House sometime after the new buildings at Hunter are ready for occupancy. While we don't yet have offices in the building, we do have meetings and events here and get our mail here.

The Council is a growing organization which now consists of 36 centers for research, policy analysis and educational programs relating to women. Most of the centers are campus-based. A number of them are not and there is a cluster of them in Washington, for example, Irene Tinker's Equity Policy Center. You will find a brochure on the resource table describing the Council and its activities. Listed under its program is "state-of-the-art seminars and conferences on collaborative research themes such as women in development, race and class gender." You will also find included under programs: "round-tables bringing together researchers and practitioners in a broad range of social concerns such as education, employment, social security, the family, and housing."

In line with that we hope that this conference will foster a continuing exchange, perhaps in the form of a seminar here at Roosevelt House. In addition, we anticipate that the Council will establish a task force for collaborative research and action in the field of Women in Development. For that reason, there are a number of Council members from outside as well as inside the New York region attending. I might mention in particular, Myra Strober of the Stanford Center for Research on Women, who is Chair of the Council's Board and Betty Dooley of the Women's Research and Education Institute of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, which has established regular channels of communication with the research centers on issues of concern to Caucus members and other policy makers in the Federal establishment.

With that, I will turn the meeting back to Penny Levy, to whom we are indebted for the idea of this conference.

APPENDIX 8A

REPORT OF WORKSHOP ON EDUCATION

Workshop Leaders: Audrey Smock, World Issues Secretary,
United Church of Christ

Pratima Kale
Save the Children

Rapporteur: Elinor Barber
Institute of International Education

The foci of discussion that emerged were the following: first, how to affect policy and practice with regard to the educational opportunities and experiences of girls and women; second, who are the change agents who might make policy and practices more favorable with regard to the interests of girls and women.

Various kinds of intervention were suggested:

1) the collection of data on access, performance, and attrition (it was noted, however, that in some instances data could be dangerous to women's interests, as for example the Kenyan data that showed that fertility rates did not decline with increased amounts of education);

2) examination systems, in two respects, namely insofar as a scrutiny of examination results may reveal discrepancies in the quality of the education received by female and male students (especially, perhaps, where education is sex-segregated), and to the extent that the introduction of certain questions on examinations may encourage teachers to include more feminist material into the content of courses;

3) The expansion of primary education, in that an increased number of schools may make these schools physically more accessible to girls and therewith reduce female illiteracy;

4) special attention to the training of girls in science and math, since these subjects, if poorly taught or not taught at all, may prevent girls from having access to higher education or to certain kinds of jobs;

5) textbook revision, to eliminate sex stereotyping;

6) the dissemination of information about centers for research on women in U.S. universities, since such information may make people realize that the kinds of problems dealt with may occur in other countries as well;

7) with some reservations, single sex education, which may provide a supportive environment for some girls and women and permit more early leadership experiences.

As for the change agents, one possibility especially emerged:

the development of middle-level female administrators (say, high school principals), who can exert considerable influence on the introduction of feminist material or concern themselves about the special reasons for dropping-out by girls.

APPENDIX 8B

REPORT OF WORKSHOP ON FERTILITY CONTROL AND REPRODUCTIVE ISSUES

Workshop Leaders: Lybia Burgos, Margaret Sanger Center
Gilbert Shimmel, Hunter College

Rapporteur: Francis Paine Conant

The workshop opened with a discussion of the relationship of sexuality to fertility and fertility control. The areas of expertise included Indonesia, Bali, Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, Ecuador, Kenya, and New Jersey. Discussants stressed the importance of religion as a relevant factor, as well as female/male relations. Involvement of men in fertility control may be necessary because in some areas it is they who decide whether or not which kind of birth control device will be used. In addition there may well be class differences in the expression of sexuality as well as in the relations between men and women affecting the use of fertility control devices (FCDs).

The question was raised of the importance in knowing actual behavior in the use and non-use of FCDs. Reported behavior may be misleading. Long-term residence among a people may be the only certain way to learn, for example, whether or not traditional abortifacients are being used as well as "officially" sponsored FCDs. Traditional alternatives to sponsored programs may account in part for changes in population and demographic statistics, including birth rates. Local administrators may be aware of the persistence of traditional methods of birth control; more remote sponsors of fertility control programs may be unaware or unwilling to recognize that the apparent success of a program or a particular device may be due in part to continued recourse to alternative and traditional means of birth and fertility control, including special coital positions and techniques such as withdrawal, as well as prolonged lactation.

In establishing a fertility control program there must be competence not only in a national language but also in local dialects. Fear may also be an important factor: fear of sanctions imposed for conceiving outside of marriage, fear of childbirth itself, and fear of the bleeding some women experience in using the IUDs. The question was asked when will men become the focus of FCDs.

Legal considerations were seen as important, not only with respect to abortion, but with regard to fixing a minimum age at marriage. The importance of an integrated approach to family planning and fertility control was noted: such programs are unlikely to succeed on their own, and are better offered in the context of health, economic, legal and educational programs. In addition, the delivery of a fertility control program is probably

best accomplished by a team involving different specialists, including health and nutrition, and researchers in the social sciences. Follow-up studies are essential. Family planning programs might also offer assistance to infertile couples as a way of gaining acceptance. The desirability was stressed of much improved communication between those involved in the delivery of fertility control programs and those doing research on related matters. It seems especially difficult to get at the reports, assessments and other materials which accumulate in offices and agencies involved in development programs.

There was agreement that both researchers and practitioners should work toward influencing decisions at policy-making levels. The workshop was judged successful, and it was hoped that the dialogue between researchers and practitioners could be continued at some future meeting.

APPENDIX 8C

REPORT OF WORKSHOP ON WOMEN IN THE WORKFORCE

Workshop Leaders: Hanna Papanek, Center for Asian Development Studies, Boston University

Ulla Olin, United Nations Development Program

Rapporteur: Janice Monk, Southwest Institute for Research on Women, University of Arizona

The majority of the approximately 20 participants in this workshop were academics with field research experience in South and Southeast Asia, West Africa, North Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean. Other participants were development consultants and personnel from programs in the United Nations Organization. Discussion centered on three issues - technical questions related to measuring women's work, the relationship between women's education and their participation in formal labor markets, and political and ethical issues relating to research and projects about women's work.

Measuring Women's Work

The invisibility of women in labor statistics was recognized as a problem for research and planners, though one that is increasingly being recognized and addressed by data collectors and users. Participants discussed changes in concepts used in data collection - e.g. "labor force" or "economic activity" and their implications for women's work.

A brief review was then provided of current efforts in United Nations agencies to improve statistical efforts internationally, focusing on programs to conduct household surveys as a supplement to census data. Also noted were short term concerns to improve interpretation of existing data and long term questions of how data collections can be improved in the next decade. Comments were made about ways to approach data collection in the field, for example, providing clear time reference periods in questionnaires so as to identify seasonal work, or probing to identify the multiple forms of work carried on by women who may initially identify themselves as housewives.

Employment and Education

Hanna Papanek introduced the discussion by reporting on the changing participation in the wage labor force of women with different levels of education and class backgrounds, providing examples from Egypt and India. In both cases rates of particip-

ation have been increasing for women with higher levels of education and decreasing for poorly educated and illiterate women. She raised the issue of the significance of these trends for educational policies and programs insofar as we are concerned with improving the economic circumstances of poor women.

Related discussions followed on the practice of employers in identifying women workers of different age, education and marital status. Particular attention was paid to the ways in which multinational corporations, e.g., in the electronics and apparel industries, segment the female labor force. The implications of changing technologies and different kinds of technology for women workers was identified as an area needing investigation.

Questions were also raised about comparative analysis on the basis of gender of the relationship between education and employment.

The final topic for discussion on this theme was the household's view of the utility of investing in education for daughters versus sons. Are there intermediate levels of education which do not enhance a woman's earning potential, for example?

Political and Ethical Issues

The discussion developed around two main questions. How can we use the research on women's work to influence policy and programs? How does feminism, as a philosophy and movement, relate to the needs and values of Third World women?

The first question was addressed primarily in terms of the aims of statistical data collection, and the uses of such data. The utility of data in consciousness raising and as a weapon for influencing resource allocation at the policy making level were suggested as lessons derived from feminist work in the United States.

The second question was raised in the context of cultural imperialism, also from concern over the conditions under which Third World women work in such enterprises as factories introduced by multinational corporations. Participants noted that in thinking about such issues we should be aware of the perspectives of those directly influenced, not only elites (particularly male elites) in the affected countries. What other employment alternatives are open to women workers -- e.g., is the choice starvation or work in poor conditions? How do women perceive their own work situation? How can influence be exerted on governments and corporations to improve conditions without causing removal of jobs to other, more permissive settings? Examples were cited of cases in which rural families have more positive views of women working outside the home than do political authorities.

The work of feminists abroad and the orientation of feminist groups toward poor women was also discussed, particularly in relation to the work of left-oriented scholars in India, and the efforts of self-employed women's associations in that country in organizing and demonstrating effectively to influence planning. Building links with Third World feminists was proposed as a productive alternative to fearful evaluations that present spreading feminism as "cultural imperialism."

APPENDIX 8D

REPORT OF WORKSHOP ON WOMEN'S PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

Workshop Leaders: Lourdes Beneria, Rutgers University
Sandra Sennett, CARE

Rapporteur: Nancy Nicalo, Church World Service

Group participants were two researchers (economics and anthropology) with the rest being practitioners. We first raised a series of questions:

How do we go about planning - bottom up, top down - is there an ideal way? At what point are women's issues brought in? What do we mean by feminist planning? As practitioners, can we help form bridges with village women? How do you involve people in a process of discovery - process of asking the right questions at right level - macro--micro?

A basic truth stated was - if women don't get involved then development doesn't work. Two arenas of planning were discussed - that of participants in external agencies, and that of indigenous agencies. In both the issues are often similar. Three issues stressed were information availability and sharing, networking and leadership development. In the community, participation is the key. An example of approach related to an invitation saying "open to women." None came. Then approach was made to invite women experts. They came. Another important step is doing proper, thorough study of existing structure and channels (networking).

We recognized the variety of important research being done, and the importance of getting results into the field in a useful form. We affirmed the effort of the conference to bring the two complementary groups together, and recognized the need for us to do more consciously within our own operating spheres.

Within the group we recognized the existence of a network channel through the International Women's Tribune Center which provides a wide range of ongoing information/communication services to women in developing countries.

APPENDIX 8E

REPORT OF WORKSHOP ON HEALTH AND FAMILY

Workshop Leaders: Helen Bratcher, Catholic Relief Service
Jan Dobbs, Teachers College, Columbia University

Rapporteur: Patricia Baldi, Center for Population and Family Health

The group reviewed the major health issues concerning women and families, particularly those relating to the developing world. These issues included the following topics:

1) Female circumcision and the difficulties in addressing this issue outside of the particular country where it is practiced;

2) Problems of malnutrition for both children and lactating mothers;

3) Issues surrounding maternal and infant mortality;

4) The need for adequate water and sanitation.

In discussing these issues it became apparent that health relates to the other major fields of interest to the conference. It is a major consideration in Development Planning. Food and Agriculture Technologies impact on nutritional status. Education is a critical factor in the decision to seek health care as well as a source for providing for more health care workers. Fertility and Reproductive Issues are an integral part of the field. Work relates to health both in terms of employment, work related hazards and economic ability to provide an adequate standard of living.

The group discussed models for delivery of services to rural areas in particular based on individual experiences in countries such as Bangladesh, Kenya, India, Somalia, and Honduras. The conclusion reached was that central health services must be extended through the use of community health care providers. The providers may be volunteers or paid and may already exist within the community necessitating retraining or upgrading of skills.

Training is particularly important for women to become providers of health care. In addition, training women to take management roles for health care systems is important as a source of employment and a way to insure that the services are responsive to the needs of the family.

Finally, the most appropriate way to institute programs by donor organizations which address the needs of women and the family is to place qualified, experienced women in policy level positions in donor agencies. The need for establishing a unified talent bank of women professionals for these positions was identified as an important step in this direction.

APPENDIX 8F

REPORT OF WORKSHOP ON FOOD AND AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGIES

Workshop Leaders: Joan Mencher, Herbert Lehman College, CUNY
Irene Tinker, Equity Policy Center

Rapporteur: Dorothy Helly, Hunter College

The participants first shared their backgrounds in the field of women and development. Irene Tinker spoke of her work at EPOC and the need to disaggregate statistics by gender; she made a point of the need to investigate development situations by looking at what people did rather than what statistical trends indicated. Dan Bates indicated that his research had dealt with investigating systems of land use by pastoral and sedentary peoples, and that he had worked both in east Africa (Kenya) and among the Turks of northeast Iran, doing household level surveys. Susan Lees explained that her field work and theoretical interests lay in the area of irrigated agriculture, where women are usually inactive; she is interested in the relationship between the decisions made by bureaucratic structures about the use of technology and actual farming activities. Joan Mencher has investigated the role of women in rice cultivation in southern India (Bengal), what activities they actually do, how they contribute to the household income, and when women are not working, why they are not working. Joyce Moock said she was interested in the intra-household income and assets in farming systems and who controlled which assets.

The group operated in its discussion on the consensus that food and water are the basic issues of life and hence agriculture is an important focus for study. National policies regarding food and water have usually been made without reference to either men or women. The participants, in this connection, raised the general question whether "cultural obstacles" as they are often referred to by policy makers and planners lay with the people doing the farming or with the assumptions of the policy makers and planners about those people and about what they -- the planners -- are actually doing.

Participants agreed that it is always necessary to focus on the regional circumstances when asking questions about any farming situation. Mencher pointed out that in studying south India it was necessary to be aware that it was a monocrop area in which there was a great scarcity of land for farming, that household and food maintenance were minimal, that people lacked work because they were impoverished. Tinker added that in Africa the problem may often be one of people not having enough time to get everything done that needs to be done. Lees commented that in irrigated regions, women have less to do with cultivation. The question in each case was what constituted the context of the near subsistence life.

The next issue addressed dealt with how to "go from studies to implementation" in the field of women and development. Here Lees gave the example of her experience as a consultant for the Peruvian government which had built a dam only to find people at the coast refusing to use the water thus made available and refusing, therefore, to pay for it. Lees said that when she studied the situation she found that among the rural proletariat the husbands had in the past come down to the coast to work, leaving their wives in the hills to cultivate; now wives were coming down to the coast as well but could get no factory work, usually mothered on the average of eight children, and found no schools available to take care of the children for any part of the day. Though farming had been the women's province, the government agronomists gathered the men together to discuss the creation of irrigation coops to use the water now available. The new dam had necessitated a male-based agriculture among a people where the women had been the farmers. The issue for the consultant was to explain to the government why the people were refusing to use the water. In this case, Lees indicated she discovered that the government bureaucrats had been discussing land use and water for cultivation and cooperative farming with the men, who in turn had to say they would talk about it with the women who knew about such things.

This led the discussion to articulate the conclusion that researchers need to know--politically--what they are being asked to do. In Lees' case, was it the job of the consultant to find a way to make the people buy the water or to find ways for the people to do economic tasks that fit into their traditional patterns of work? The politics behind the building of the dam in the first place were discussed: were they important to the decisions the consultant was being asked to make? The consultant can supply the inexplicit assumptions of the people implementing the technological interventions, and the consultant can also supply the assumptions of the goals of intervention as well.

This raised a discussion of whether and how to consider how to minimize the negative impact of such technological interventions, and in particular on women--within the power structures that govern their lives. Plainly stated, the question raised was "If governments articulate a project which provides employment for men at the expense of women, should the consultant try to help bring this project about--in the face of cultural values to the contrary? What are the alternatives?"

Moock raised the issue of consultants in development areas facing questions of whether a government in suggesting technological change is dedicated to the alleviation of the poverty of its populace and the empowerment of the people affected, or the continuation of power of the elite making the decisions. Any change of a substantial kind, she noted, involves income transfers. Is it the role of the social scientist to publicize what

isn't working?

Tinker said that African governments in the past decided to subsidize agriculture in order to supply growing urban areas, and that a current issue involved the possible change of that policy and that the ramifications will be for women who have been involved in a major way with agriculture in those countries.

All agreed that planning for intervention of any kind in a development area had to be contextual and disaggregated, but what the role of the social scientist was with regard to such changes that alleviated "symptoms" only was left a problem for continued consideration.